FY 08 Local Plan Review Checklist

Please review entire proposal before calling/ emailing center with questions, where possible. For example, even if a subgrant does not match a topic on the approved list of foci, complete the review, and combine questions prior to consulting.

OVERALL

— All required sections submitted
— All parts of section included
— Cover page with signatures included
— All subgrants $50,000 or more, except for possibly one with remainder monies
— At least one cluster project if more than $100.000 in budget
— All centerwide subgrants titled with topic from approved list (see Local Plan)
    If not, why not? Is the unapproved project well designed and worthy of approval?

SECTION 1 -- Narrative

— Note any inaccurate CIP Codes (see CIP Code reference list)
— Compare last year's center program list with this year's
  - **Any dropped programs**
    - if CIP Code missing this year, then note to ask if program dropped

  - **Any new programs?**
    - if new, validate CIP Code used
    - ask appropriate cluster consultant if this program was approved
    - ask for Regional Advisory Board (RAB) approval
    - if no competency list, flag → work with DoE through new program template

NOTE: this is a good time to meet with cluster consultants to discuss and ask about what they know regarding new programs proposed, where centers are in process, whether competency lists exist, and if not, whether they are going through the new program approval process)

A. Review each program description
  - Must align with CIP Code competency list (if can't tell, need more info)
  - Duration of program required
  - Key learning focus
  - Must list key occupations program is preparing people to do
  - Must list any prerequisites
  - Is other information accurate (e.g. – embedded credits?)

B. Local Adjusted Levels of Performance
  - Check for accuracy of baseline data (FY06 spreadsheet sent out with plans)
  - Must show continuous increase form baseline (can be as little as 0.25%)

C. Narrative about center compliance with Perkins IV – most of this section is federally required and will be quite lofty and general in response more than likely. Pay closest attention to items 5 & 6 (professional development and evaluation of CTE programs).
- ＿ Check to see if all (1-7) pieces included
- ⸺ Part 1 -- are all parts (a,b,c) included?
- ⸺ Part 2 -- check '06 data to see if meeting targets for
    a. nontraditional participation
    b. nontraditional completion
  - ⸺ if lower than state averages, note that it is low; need improvement plan for this\
- ⸺ Part 3 -- check '06 data for special populations – in there or not?
- ⸺ Part 4 -- check for guidance career info – does it appear to be integrated into student experience at the Center?
- ⸺ Part 5 basis for professional development decisions – how deciding?
    a. Coherent professional development plan in place
    b. Can you determine from the plan how the Director ensures that ongoing PD has direct application to the classroom?
- ＿ Item 6 – what are their measures for program quality?
- ＿ Item 7 – this is just a federal required part of plan

SECTION 2 – Improvement Strategies

- ⸺ Review 06 database (P-drive) to identify all measures that center needs improvement goals to address
- ⸺ Compare with what is submitted
- ⸺ Did they include all indicators they need to address? If not, which are missing?
- ⸺ Did they address all with
  - relevant improvement goals,
  - strategies for implementation (at least 2 for each one?)
  - logically and valuable actions in relation to strategy and goal
  - intermediate measurement indicators to determine if they are on the right track?
- ⸺ Do they seem to understand the problem they are trying to address?
- ＿ Is how they are spending their monies related to improvement goals and actions?
  **Review Subgrant information from Section 2 with budget information regarding subgrants in Section 3

SECTION 3 -- Subgrants

For each **centerwide** subgrant
- ⸺ Does it address an approved centerwide project? (see list in RFP)
- ⸺ Is there a sound rationale for selecting this project?
- ⸺ Does it describe strategies that cohesively address the project?
- ⸺ Are there multiple strategies (asks for multiple)
- ⸺ Are goals/ objectives appropriate?
- ⸺ Are they measurable, articulate, addressing goal?
- ⸺ Does $ used reflect the strategies and actions described for the improvement plan?
- ⸺ Are identified expenditures legitimate under Perkins IV?

— Are identified expenditures appropriately coded under federal required and permissive uses?
— Do codes match up with the expenses described?
— Do we need to address legal department with any questions? (eg. Can federal $$ be used for marketing/ promotion … versus guidance?)

Please note changes that need to be made to conform to these requirements.

For each **cluster** subgrant
— Is cluster accurately identified?
— Is rationale for project improvement focus clear and appropriate?
— Is project clearly defined?
— Does project address cluster?
— Are goals clearly defined?
— Do goals address project needs and cluster needs defined in rationale?
— Are activities clearly defined?
— Are activities aligned with project goals?
— Are there plans in place to assess success of project?
— Are assessment indicators measurable and aligned with project goals and rationale?

Please note changes that need to be made to conform to these requirements.

After Competing Review of Complete Plan:

1. Make decision on approved or not approved
2. draft brief rationale for decision
3. state clearly what center must do to correct and re-submit
4. Draft letter
   a. Approved (use standard letter provided)
   b. Not Approved (be specific in what needs to be done and by when)
5. See Kay or Kim to discuss your recommendations
6. Call the Director to inform of decision and that formal letter will come via email ASAP.